America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

Number 85 **WWW.CODOH.COM** **November 2001**

Whatever Happened to Israel?

George Brewer

In the immediate aftermath of the destruction of September 11, several voices were raised that attempted to link the attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon to Greater Israel's ongoing problems with its subject Palestinian population. Indeed, the former Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, in a stunning display of cynicism, at first proclaimed the attacks "very good" for Israel. According to news reports, some Israelis seemed to be quite eager to express their solidarity with such loaded comments as "Now you understand what we have to deal with every day" or "Now you [Americans] are real Israelis."

Opinion mongers were not far behind; David Gelerntner, a columnist for the National Review, flatly stated that the Twin Towers were attacked largely because of America's "decency" in standing up for little Israel. Michael Ledeen, from the same source, proclaimed that America's first reaction to the attack should be to move the American Embassy from

Continued on page 6

THE CAMPUS PROJECT

A NEW AD, NEW OP-EDS, A SMALL WAR – IT ALL ADDS UP

There's something different about the Campus Project this year. The most obvious difference is that I am not running big ads with hundreds of words of text, but a very small ad with only one word of text – WHY? – and the Online address of ***The Revisionist***. The next thing to say is that while I have not generated stories in the print press that I am aware of, yet, which is a disappointment, the hit count on CODOHWeb has gone over 900,000 (!) accesses in the last 30-day period

Something else is different about the Campus Project this academic year. The acceptance rate for the "WHY?" ad (see **SR84**) is much higher than it has been for large, text-rich ads that I have run before. I suppose the reason is that because the new ad contains no text, there is nothing there to be objected to in the first moment. Ad managers think nothing of running it, while editors feel like they are not in danger of being attacked by faculty and administration for running something so inoffensive.

A second aspect to the Campus Project this year is that the CODOH ads will run one time each week for four weeks. The strategy presupposes that while those who are in the business of suppressing my ads everywhere, can let this one go one week, but that they will not want to let it go for three or four weeks. Too dangerous.

As of this writing the "WHY?" ad is running at Boston College, (Catholic), Wright State U, Cal State U at Stanislaus, Carnegie Mellon in Pittsburgh, DePaul U in Chicago (Catholic), Occidental College, Oklahoma U, Portland U, Queens College (Long Island NY), Scripps

Continued on bottom of page 2

LETTERS

I look forward to your observations regarding Smith's Report *and the issues it addresses. I read everything you write. Oftentimes it influences how I handle the work. Unfortunately, I cannot reply to correspondence. Not enough hours in the day. I have space to print a very small number of your letters. If you do not want your name published in* **SR**, *please make that plain. Thanks.*

Smith's Report 84 addresses the latest of the great intellectual discussions which will be more appreciated in the future than, perhaps, it is now. I hope we can preserve it.

I read with great appreciation your personal report of September 11th. As it happens my wife and I were approaching New York by car (we were driving north from Florida where we now live) at the time of the attack. We saw the plume of smoke. I knew personally some victims, but my instant reactions (and still the same) were very much like your own.

I'm afraid that I can't quite go along with Ralph Marquardt's letters in 84. I think he was overtaken by the emotional impact of the day (September 11). It is far too early for revisionists to make the conclusions he has. The Israeli counter-offensive against the implications is just one reason.

As for George Brewer, I suggest he too should "cool it". At bottom, he doesn't seem to have any strategic suggestions for revisionists. An assault on "the elite" is too broad to have any importance. I learned long ago that one should stick to what one is good at -- in our case undermining the "Holocaust" stories. I expect that Brewer is an academic (hiss, boo!)

Finally, both Marquardt and Brewer and perhaps yourself fall into the "oil" trap. This is the idea that the obvious dependence of our country on foreign oil (principally from the Middle East) somehow skews U.S. policy in this area. While it is true that our government, of whatever stripe, is concerned to secure Middle East oil supplies it is simply incorrect to assume that this is a dominating driving force in the present situation, although perhaps it should be.

I spent a good deal of my professional life involved in these matters and I do not think this establishes me as a final authority on all oil business, but I have a few facts to point out.

First and foremost, the international oil companies, and the U.S. companies in particular, have virtually *no stake* in the oil resources of the Middle East. They have long since lost their equity position in ownership of the reserves. Venezuela and Libya started it, but Iran, Saudi Arabia and Iraq (and the others) now own their own reserves and the internationals are mostly buyers of crude oil. These governments want them only as suppliers of capital for gas exploitation and other marginal investments. So the "oil conspiracy" idea is largely fiction.

As for the impact on the Holocaust controversy, I do not agree that there is any need for revisionists to back off. All the talk about the great victories of revisionism is just plain dumb. Holocaust revisionism is still censored, misrepresented and generally reviled in academia. The game is still on.

Albert Doyle

Here is a little something to keep you going. As far as I can see, you are the only voice out there with the other side of the story. In my opinion, the correct side. There is much misery in store for the U.S. if they do not cut loose from Israel. We are making one billion fanatical enemies. After over fifty years support and hundreds of billions of dollars to Israel what is our dividend? The World Trade Center.

Larry Richards, San Diego

In Smith's Report # 83 you quote some emails from me with some editing. The actual text in my email reads:

> ... in some future "New Order" of their own. While making good points on the present day hypocrisy concerning such stuff as the "Holocaust", [it's quite visible that they] are not exactly fond of "libertarian" ideas [SUCH AS MAY] affirm the supremacy of flesh-blood-and-mind individuals over countries, races and other [similarly childish] abstractions.

As quoted (and edited) in SR:

> ... in some future "New Order" of their own. While making good points on the present day hypocrisy concerning such stuff as the "Holocaust", [some of these people] are not exactly fond of libertarian ideas [AND] affirm the supremacy of flesh-blood-and-mind individuals over countries, races and other [similar] abstractions.

The important change is uppercased: "AND affirm" (the people we are talking about) completely changes the meaning of "SUCH AS MAY affirm" (meaning the libertarian ideas).

I would be grateful if you corrected this small business in the next Report. Thanks.

ASMarques

Done. Apologies. BRS

CAMPUS REPORT

College, Syracuse U, U Cincinnati, U Kansas, U Michigan-Flint, U Nebraska (Lincoln), U Toledo, U Washington, U Wisconsin–Eau Clair, U Indiana, Baylor U, Indiana U, and U Wisconsin – Whitewater.

Some papers will not run a one-column by two-inch ad so in a couple cases I added a little text so that it would meet minimum requirements. A couple papers accepted the ad, then suffered a change of mind. The *Shorthorn* at U Texas-Arlington is one. The *Aztec* at San Diego State U ran it one time, then backed out. I haven't had time to find out what the story is in either case. There are half a dozen other campus where I have been notified that the ad is running, or will run, or that they are willing to run the ad but need prepayment but do not accept Visa so I have to send a check by mail

and in a couple cases cashier's checks. Which is something of a bother since I cannot buy a U.S. cashier's check in Mexico.

And then there is the issue that I have submitted the ad to less than ten percent of the campuses that are on my list. It's clear that I would not have enough money to pay for placing even this small ad in all the papers that appear ready to run it – which could run to several hundred. Moe than nine hundred thousand hits! How much of it is do to the placement of the ad?

And then, to refresh your memory, I decided sometime ago that I wanted to get away from running large provocative advertisements as the tactic had become predictable, the reaction had become predictable, and thus increasingly less effective. This was simply my opinion, based on my experience. It was time to begin mainstreaming revisionism in a way that would be, might be, acceptable to the press and the professorial class. one way or the other on the opinion. Like the rest of life – easier said than done. But when you mainstream an idea, it can be talked about openly. You can't "force" people to take an idea seriously – unless you want to initiate great violence. I don't.

So my decision was to not roll out with one editorial-advertisement during the academic year, but submit anywhere from ten to twenty opinion pieces for publication. Hundreds of campus editors will receive materials promoting revisionism and CODOHWeb ten to twenty times during the year instead of one time. And each Op-ED that is run will be run *free*! I will have only the mailing costs, which I can handle. The idea is to address a current, hot, mainline issue beginning from mainline perspective, then move the argument into revisionist territory.

I did report here that during the summer I submitted the first Op-Ed of the project. It was titled "The Palestinians are Doing it All Wrong." It was the first time I had submitted anything to a college paper during the summer, but I wanted to get going so I took a run at it. It bombed. It ran nowhere that I know of, except in *Viernes*, here in Baja. You don't always know when your stuff runs because student editors oftentimes do not inform you, but I have heard nothing so I suppose it ran nowhere.

Being used to failure in this business, I paid no attention to the failure of one article. In early September I submitted a second piece titled: "Why Do Islamic Radicals Want to Kill Americans." This time I was published in at least two student newspapers: *The Buchtelite* at U Akron (the editor of which changed the, which editors have the right to do), and the *News Record* at U Cincinnati. It was published in a third paper as well and (this is a little stupid) I've lost track of which one. Unfortunately, the *Buchtelite* has a policy of not printing a contact number for the author of their opinion pieces, while the editor at the *News Record* informed me, apologizing, that she had forgotten to do this. So these two publications of the Op-Ed had little or no role in the huge hit-count on CODOHWeb, which after all is the purpose of the exercise – take students and professors to where the information is. "Islamic Radicals" is reproduced below from the *Buchtelite*.

During the week of 8 October I mailed a second Op-Ed piece to editors in about 20 states. It's titled "Men of Principle" and discuses the principles of President Bush and Osama bin Laden, as best I can fathom them. It is reaching the desks of editors as I write this. This morning I heard from the *Daily Emerald* at U Oregon saying they want to run it but that it has to be cut to 550 words. I'll take a run at it.

Meanwhile, I have heard from Brian Swope, Editor in Chief of the *Temple News*, Temple U in Philadelphia, informing me that the *News* will not publish my Op-Ed "The Palestinians Are Doing It All Wrong" because it fuels intolerance and "the actions you endorse do little to promote what this world needs, more understanding and less hatred." The thesis of the my Op-Ed – this was back in August -- was that Palestinians should stop making human bombs of themselves and follow the lead of Gandhi and Marin Luther King – that is, to start marching and sitting down and stop killing Israelis in pizzerias. After what happened at the World Trade Center I think I'll stay with my perspective and allow the *Temple News* to stay with theirs.

-- BRS

The Buchtelite Online

Home | Contact Us | Advertising | Archives

Why is there hate for America?
Theories on why US is a terrorist target

October 4, 2001

By Bradley R. Smith
Buchtelite Contributor

Why do Islamic radicals want to kill innocent Americans? I'm not certain that I know, but I have a novel idea. Let's listen to what they say.

For example, Ramzi Ahmed Yousef is the old blind cleric who helped organize the *first* terrorist attack on the World Trade Center. Yousef was sentenced to life

imprisonment for his role in the bombing. In January 1998 the *New York Times* published excerpts from his statement to the court.

> *You keep [saying] collective punishment and killing innocent people to force governments to change their policies [is wrong and] you call this terrorism ....*
>
> *You ... introduced this type of terrorism to the history of mankind when you dropped an atomic bomb which killed tens of thousands of women and children in Japan and when you killed over a hundred thousand people, most of them civilians, in Tokyo with fire bombings. You killed them by burning them to death. And you killed civilians in Vietnam with chemicals as with the so-called Orange agent.... You went to wars more than any other country in this century, and then you have the nerve to talk about killing innocent people.*
>
> *And now you have invented new ways to kill innocent people. You have so-called economic embargo [against Iraq] which kills nobody other than children and elderly people ....*
>
> *Yes, I am a terrorist and I am proud of it. And I support terrorism so long as it [is] against the United States Government and against Israel, because you are more than terrorists.... You are butchers, liars and hypocrites.*

Rings a bell for me. But then I've been working with revisionist theory for the last twenty years. Revisionism prepares you to view American foreign policy, and terrorism, from a perspective that is not insular in its Americanism. For the last three or four decades revisionist theory has been absorbed with addressing issues about the intentional killing of German and Japanese civilians during World War II, the allegedly unique monstrosity of (particularly) the Germans, and the lying and hypocrisy that has been employed by our cultural elites, including the professorial class, to cover up the real history of that time and to marginalize what they cannot bury.

When Ramzi Ahmed Yousef accuses American of being "butchers," he refers to the intentional killing of hundreds of thousands of Japanese civilians in mass fire bombings, which was American policy, and the nuclear destruction of the civilian populations of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. In the *New York Times* excerpt Yousef does not mention the intentional slaughter of hundreds of thousands of German civilians in mass terror bombings – but then this is the New York Times and The *Times* does not specialize in viewing Germans of that period as, well – human beings.

When Ramzi Ahmed Yousef argues that Americans are "hypocrites" he refers to the fact that at the very time when he was convicted of the intentional killing of seven or eight civilians at the World Trade Center, the US was enforcing an economic blockade on Iraq that had resulted in the deaths of tens, if not hundreds of thousands of Iraqi (Arab) children. That is, the American government was pursuing a policy of "collective punishment and killing innocent people to force governments to change their policies ...." Hypocrisy in spades.

"Lying?" Those in the US Government? No need to go into it.

Presently the Bush people, backed by the US Congress, are busy making plans to rid the world of "terrorists" once and for all. They are preparing to "hunt them down," "smoke" them out of their hiding places, and bring them to justice "dead or alive." If we ever lay our hands on Osama Bin Laden, for example, and he lives through it, I suppose he will be put on trial and after he is convicted (let's not kid ourselves here) he will be allowed to make his own statement to the court. What will he say about terrorism? Here are a few lines culled from a long interview he gave to ABC's John Miller.

> *Your situation with Muslims in Palestine is shameful, if there is any shame left in America. ... American history does not distinguish between civilians and military, and not even women and children. [Americans] are the ones who used the {nuclear] bomb against Nagasaki. ...*
>
> *We do not differentiate between those dressed in military uniforms and civilians; they are all targets in this fatwa. ...The fatwa includes all that share or take part in [the] killing of Muslims, assaulting holy places, or those who help the Jews occupy Muslim land. ... The American government ... has no choice but to pull its sons from the Holy Land especially and the Muslim land in general. And to refrain from supporting in any way the Israeli government and Jews who occupy our land.*

In short, Osama will say about what Ramzi Ahmed Yousef said three years ago. He will say that the second – final -- attack on the World Trade Center was the result of American foreign policy, which, among other things, is a witch's brew of butchery, lies, and hypocrisy.

Bradley R. Smith is publisher of ***The Revisionist****, America's only Online revisionist E-zine*
www.codoh.org

It costs about $90 to print, stuff, and mail an Op-Ed article, a cover letter, background, and return envelope to 100 campus and off-campus newspapers. Three hundred newspapers? -- $270. And so on. Your help with these costs will be much appreciated. Without your help, how will they go out at all? --BRS

"Revisionist" Librarian Disciplined for Making Critical Remarks about Israel. Forces University to Apologize.

This is a wonderful story of a "campus project" that was initiated without the help or knowledge of CODOH. It provides good evidence that the First Amendment is still operative, and that each time one individual stands up publicly to say what he thinks, the First is strengthened.

October 4: Article appears in the UCLA *Daily Bruin* informing us that a university librarian has been "suspended without pay from September 17 to 21 for sending a mass-e-mail criticizing what he called the U.S. support of apartheid policies in Israel." The librarian, one Jonnie Hargis, works at the Young Research Library at UCLA, and he had responded to a sincere, sentimental, patriotic mass e-mail sent to he and his co-workers after the 911 attacks on the World Trade Center.

In his response Hargis wrote that United States taxpayers "fund and arm a state called Israel, which is responsible for untold thousands upon thousands of deaths of Muslim Palestinian children and civilians." He ended his message by stating, "... so, who are the 'terrorists' anyway?"

Library administrators find out about the e-mail and on 14 September and reprimands Hargis in a letter: "Your recent e-mail, which was distributed to the entire unit, demonstrated a lack of sensitivity that went beyond incivility and became harassment." Hargis is given pay for the rest of that day and asked to leave the library.

Michelle Torre, who works in Hargis' department, sent the original patriotic e-mail. She said she was not the subject of any disciplinary action or reprimand, but would not comment further.

October 5: the *Daily Bruin* publishes an editorial headed "Freedom of Speech Under Attack at YRL." It notes that the new policy, under which Hargis is being disciplined, and which prohibits unsolicited e-mails containing political, religious or patriotic messages to library department lists, "was made public only after [sic] Hargis' response to Torre's patriotic e-mail."

This raises many concerns about free speech – or the lack of it – at this university. Regardless of whether someone is a research professor or library staff member, no one should be subject to suspension or dismissal for voicing their beliefs at work if they're not subtracting from the working environment. In a time of blind patriotism, critics of this country have an even more precarious, though important, role in providing additional and contradictory viewpoints to the public forum. Hargis was only acting in the best interests of a pluralist society. Since the new library policy represents a direct attack on Hargis' and other workers' right to free speech, it needs to be retracted immediately.

Hargis' suspension should be overturned and he should be given full pay for the lost time at work. Additionally, Kram and the library administrators involved in this decision must issue an apology to Hargis, admitting that they singled him out for disciplinary action unfairly.

October 10: *The Chronicle Daily News* (Chronicle of Higher Education) runs a story headed: "Union Files Grievance on Behalf of UCLA Librarian Suspended for Message About Terrorism"

Mr. Hargis's message, which went to the recipients of the original message, accused the United States and Israel of waging their own terrorist campaigns against civilian Iraqis and Palestinians. (...) He also accused the United States of killing "hundreds of thousands of noncombatant Muslim civilians" in bombings of Iraq. His letter closed by asking, "So, who are the 'terrorists' anyway?" Mr. Hargis said Tuesday that he had responded to the original message because he found it "jingoistic, chauvinistic, and over the top."

(...) The Coalition of University Employees, in the grievance it filed, argues that administrators denied Mr. Hargis his free-speech rights and unfairly singled him out for punishment, said Liz Go, an organizer with the union.

In the grievance, the union asks the university to apologize to Mr. Hargis, compensate him for the pay he lost during his suspension, and require managers and employees at the university to undergo diversity training.

Because of his suspension, Mr. Hargis has become a mini-celebrity, appearing on three radio talk shows in California.

October 12: The Associated Press picks up the Hargis story as part of a widespread patriotically inspired movement emerging on university campuses. "College Faculty, Staff Find Chilling New Climate for Free Speech on Campus"

(...) Hargis gave The Associated Press copies of both e-mail messages.

Hargis has worked at the library 22 years. He said the policy was news to him, and that he was the only one punished. Library officials declined to talk about the case, but furnished a copy of the policy.

October 15: The *Daily Californian* at UC Berkeley joined the fray. "UCLA Librarian Appeals Suspension For Mass E-mail Letter Sent to Co-Workers Criticized U.S. Foreign Policy."

(...) *"The e-mail I got was flag waving nonsense. It was offensive to me and I responded to it," he said.*

Hargis said the policy is particularly upsetting because it seems to contradict the current standing campus e-mail policy, which states that "the University, in general, cannot and does not wish to be the arbiter of Electronic Mail ... or protect users from receiving Electronic Mail they may find offensive. (...) I was simply making a statement about our foreign policy. This is like the thought police—this is something out of Orwell. They are trying to find me guilty of something that existed after I did it."

(...) *"They make me seem like a raving lunatic," he said. "But it all comes down to people with ties to Israel who don't want their sacred cow criticized. People can debate that with me, and that is an issue that should be debated. But I should be allowed to say what I think."*

Claudia Horning, president of the UCLA Coalition of University Employees union, said this disciplinary case is quite unusual because of the historic role that libraries have played in defending First Amendment liberties.

"This is infuriating to me," [Hargis] said. "Who is the university to take one-fourth of my pay for one month for exercising my right to free speech? I don't make that much to begin with—I'm a library assistant for God's sake.

Liza Go, Hargis's union representative, said the grievance filed by the union asks that the university rescind its discipline of Hargis and return benefits and back wages. The union also seeks an apology from library management and sensitivity training in the workplace. "Everybody has the right to send and receive speech," Go said. "There is no law that says you can only transmit nonpolitical, non-controversial, perky e-mails."

(...) In the meantime, Hargis has gained fame through his appearances on several radio talk shows and two articles in the student newspaper, the Daily Bruin.

"They just didn't count on me fighting like this," he said. "They know that what they have done is in violation of the First Amendment, and I will fight this to the bitter end."

October 18. I learn through the grapevine that UCLA has thrown in the towel. It is going to reinstate Hargis at his workplace and make a public apology. Hargis is considering suing the university and is looking for a lawyer. The union will not make a public statement until some of the legal ramifications are worked out. If Hargis does sue his complaint will include, among other things, knowingly false accusations made by the university, the stress and fear of having received a number of death threats because of the way the story was twisted by the administration, workplace discrimination, and from what I can make out, the fact that Hargis was suspended "against the advice of legal counsel." That is, it was pure politics, used to punish an employee of twenty-two years for making statements critical of American foreign policy with regard to Israel.

I think it is clear that if Hargis does bring a case against the University of California at Los Angeles that it will speak to the protection of all workers, to the fact that even great academic institutions must be held accountable for offending the First Amendment, and to the public good in being informed about how the professorial class and those who administer it need to be held to the standards that they themselves preach about with such solemnity. A couple cheers for the *Daily Bruin's* straight-ahead reporting. And a full three cheers for Jonnie Hargis.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO ISRAEL?

Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, although the usefulness of that gesture would be hard to interpret. (Pundit watchers know that Ledeen's demand that the US move its embassy is a rhetorical ritual reminiscent of Cato's calls for Carthage's destruction.)

In any case, these voices, public and private, seemed to assume that by proclaiming a connection, Israel would be given a green light to wreak violence on the Palestinians without further protest from Washington weaklings. To a certain extent, this was even true, as in the first few days after the attacks Sharon's trophy hunters killed some two dozen Palestinians.

We must confess that it was our fear of such opportunistic destruction that led us, in our first evaluation of the matter on September 15, to expose the false bottom to the argument. That is, we took pains to show that the linkage of the terrorist attacks on America with Israel's policies was not only false, but even dangerous to Jewish interests. Our reasoning was twofold. First, that Arabs hate the US for many reasons, more of them having to do with oil and their own societies than with Israel. Second, we argued that pro-Israel commentators, by insinuating Israel into the discussion, were actually inviting the American people to take a long hard look at how the "Middle East's only democracy" actually treats its subjects.

THE SWITCH

Imagine our surprise, when, over the past few weeks, Israel's connection to the 911 Terror Attacks has disappeared off the radar screens of polite punditry. Now, it is routinely argued that Israel's persecution of the Palestinian people has absolutely nothing to do with the Islamic terrorism that destroyed the Twin Towers. The new posture has gone to such absurd lengths that the mayor of New York, Rudolf Giuliani, rejected a $10 million dollar donation from a Saudi prince simply because the check came accompanied by a rather gentle reminder that the inequities of the Palestinian situation aggravated an already volatile climate of despair. Hence, almost 20% of the fund set aside for the victims and families of the World

Trade Center collapse was thrown away by the Mayor in order to be politically correct.

This reversal of attitudes concerning Israel's linkage to the attacks has not been the only switch in the landscape. Far from allowing Greater Israel a free hand with its Arabs, the Bush White House, after a few days of distraction, has made it very clear that it will no longer tolerate Israeli foot dragging in terms of achieving a political solution in Palestine. These promptings have been accompanied by a great deal of talk about the forthcoming Palestinian state. Evidently, the Bush White House has also made it clear to Israel that it will no longer be able to engage in such flagrant practices as using American attack helicopters and fighter jets against the Palestinians as before. There have been some bizarre actions on Israel's part in response to these pressures, including a memorable and typically self-centered press conference by Sharon.

TWO NEW EXCUSES

As a last redoubt against the winds of change, the defenders of Israel have fallen back on two new arguments. One is that any talk of the Palestinian situation at this time, either as regards a Palestinian state or an alleviation of the miserable conditions under which Israel forces them to live, is ill timed. The first argument variously claims either that such gestures "encourage" terrorism, or that they "distract" the anti-Osama coalition from the military operations at hand. The second rather hoary argument, given full expression by Bob Bartley of the Wall Street Journal, is that the roots of Islamic terrorism as well as Palestinian unrest are the same: envy at Israel's "success."

Taking the second argument first, it is certainly somewhat questionable to discuss Israel as a "success." Most "successful" states, say, Germany or Japan, don't require $2 billion in economic and humanitarian aid, something which Israel requires every year (in addition to another $2 billion in weapons.) Further, no state can be counted a "success" when nearly 40% of its population lives in under severe conditions of economic deprivation, as has the Palestinian population for over 30 years under Israel's effectual control. True, Israelis may feel that they are unjustly held accountable for the miserable lives of the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. In that case, however, there is a simple solution. They can leave.

But there is a more malicious dimension to Bartley's self-satisfied argument. It is hard to see how the Palestinians can achieve any kind of economic success when their water is rationed by the Israelis, and when their houses, orchards, crops, and fields are routinely bulldozed. In fact, such practices would seem to condemn the Palestinians to perpetual poverty and Bartleyan "envy." Maybe the people over at the Wall Street Journal don't understand that capital cannot accumulate when it is continually being destroyed.

The first argument, in all of its variants, contends that addressing the human rights of the Palestinians is "dangerous." Since, however, the "war against terrorism" will supposedly last for many years, we are now supposed to accept the idea that any resolution of the Palestinian situation will have to wait until a victorious conclusion is achieved. In effect, this argument is nothing more than a plea to go on doing nothing.

CONCLUSION

To its credit, the Bush White House has made it clear that it is not going to be dissuaded from the path of fairness by the manufactured casuistry of those who sound like they were raised on Ariel Sharon's ostrich farm. This administration recognizes that there is no more room for temporizing, and, if in fact the plight of the Palestinians is frequently, and wrongly, invoked by Bin Laden and his ilk for demagogic purposes, that does not mean that the Palestinian cause is irrelevant for achieving peace and stability in the Middle East.

For as long as the Palestinian problem is allowed to fester, the more Israel undercuts its own security, and its own Jewishness in the long run; and the televised discrimination and killing goes on, the more disaffected and ill-placed young men, throughout the Arab world, will continue to flock to the banner of terrorism. Hence a just and equitable settlement in the Middle East is necessary, not only to thwart terrorism, but because it is right, and because we lose our humanity and our sense of justice if we keep our heads buried in the sand, pretending that the problem is not there.

CODOH ON THE INTERNET

We had more traffic on CODOHWeb during September than any month since we began the site – some 643,150 hits. That's 58,600 more hits than during August. But as I mentioned here last month, from here on out I am going to count from the 16th to through the 15th of each month so that the figures that I publish here will be more up to date. The hits on CODOHWeb for the 30 days starting 16 September and ending 15 October were – 910,550 (!).

There must be more than one reason for these numbers. To begin with the obvious, there is President Bush's war against (some) terrorism. But those who are interested in Muslim fanatics are not going to turn immediately to a Website that focuses on H. revisionism. Still, there is the connection with the Israeli-Palestinian war, and once the attention of the innocent is drawn to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict the H. story is bound to come up sooner or later. Somewhat tenuous.

There are the little ads I'm running, not to try to make a revisionist argument in the ad itself, but to take people to CODOH-Web – where the information is. The ad is doing its work. Nine hundred thousand hits? The Op-Eds are not producing yet – except among newspaper staffs themselves. And of course there is word-of-mouth, and there is the war. How do we judge the mix? We're just going to continue doing what we're doing. One thing is certain; we are being monitored very closely.

Example: this by our friends at the ADL, which, while they posted it after the 911 attack, quoted from my "Palestinians Are Doing It All Wrong" article written during the previous month urging Palestinians to march and sit down rather than making human bombs of themselves.

ADL: WORLD WIDE WEB

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH).

Added 9/19/01. CODOH, a Holocaust denial organization headed by Bradley Smith, has published four articles about the September 11 attacks on its Web site. "I understand how the Holocaust story is implicated in the hatred so many in the Muslim world feel towards America," Smith writes. "The story was used to morally legitimate the creation of the Israeli State on Palestinian land, and America approved." According to Smith, "Americans and Israelis share the same self-righteousness, greed, and contempt for others that have brought this tragedy upon us, which is surely not the last one." Smith believes that it is likely that there will be "a rise of anti-Jewish anger among a minority of Americans who are half-awake with regard to the grievous behavior of the Israelis." Smith said the Palestinians have become "copycat figures of the Israelis they hate," because they have been acting out of rage.

[*Six days later the ADL felt it necessary to report to its readers comments made by John Wier in* **The Revisionist Online**. *The ADL knows that people are reading* **TR** *– or it would not bother with us. They have a $50-million yearly budget yet feel obligated to monitor a Website that has no budget. We* are *being read – and that's the danger. We are being read.*]

ADL: WORLD WIDE WEB

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH).

Added 9/25/01. John Weir, writing on the CODOH Web site, blames U.S. support of Israel for the attacks. According to Weir, an "arrogant U.S. policy" that has ignored the Palestinian refugee problem and encouraged "Zionist tyranny in Lebanon and the occupied territories" is likely at the root of the problem. Weir believes that there is no good reason to continue supporting Israel because "the U.S. gets nothing from this relationship-except the tab." He fears that Americans are often disinterested in foreign policy. "For everyone other than perhaps a small group of Zionists—foreign policy doesn't measure high in polls," he explains. "Zionist Jews, however, are well organized and politically active. They contribute to candidates. They are involved in the political parties. When it comes to foreign policy, they have no domestic competition in setting the agenda.

Well said, John.

Meanwhile, I have come across software programs that might allow us to promote CODOHWeb on the Internet – I'm not kidding here – *a hundred times* more effectively than we are promoting it now. I have always focused on taking revisionism to college campuses through the print press. I may be about to shift emphasis here to take advantage of the remarkable programs that are being developed for the Internet. And I think for the first time, particularly with the Op-Ed project, that I can start taking the work to mid-level city and community newspapers as well. I have to think ahead here and not just jump (I have a tendency to jump) into something before I am (relatively) certain that we can handle it.

Due to the anthrax scare, which I think is blown way out of proportion (even though I used the anthrax "image" – ignorantly -- in on of my Op-Eds) there are new U.S. Post Office regulations that state that mail sent without a return address is going to receive "special handling." Those who do not like to put a return address on letters are hereby warned.

Please do what you can to help with the project. Media pundits and politicos around the world believe we are at a pivotal moment in history. We probably are. This may also be a pivotal moment in the history of the struggle for a free press and an open debate on the H. story. Finally!

Please don't count on the other guy to help. That's the guy who keeps forgetting. You're the one – there's no one else.

Bradley

Smith's Report

is produced by
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29
you will receive eleven issues of
Canada and Mexico $35
Overseas $39

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, California 92143

Voice Mail: 619 685 2163

Tel & Fax (Baja):

011 52 661 23984

E-mail: brsmith@telnor.net

On the Web: www.codoh.com